(4)

(2)

SINGLE BENCH

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (C.G.).

WRIT PETITION NO. (CIVIL). 1229/07 2007

(Single Bench Civil Matter).

PETITIONER :- SMT. EKTA DHODY

aged about 31 years

W/o Shri Atul Dhody,

C/o DHODY PETROL PUMP

G.E. ROAD DURG,

Post, Tah. & Distt. DURG (C.G.).

P.R. No. 917/07
Presented by Shri K.G. Tamaskar
dated 2/2/07

::VERSUS::

RESPONDENTS (1) SANJEEV KUMAR AGRAWAL

aged about 37 years,

S/o Shri R.K. Agrawal

R/o House No. 1293

Street No. 7, New Shanti Nagar,

Post, Tah. & Distt. RAIPUR (C.G.).

(2) UNITED INDIA INSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED

Divisional Office,

Kachhari Chowk,

RAIPUR (C.G.).

(3) STATE OF CHHATTISGARH,

Through - Station House Incharge

Police Station - Mohan Nagar, DURG,

Tah. & Distt. DURG (C.G.).

NOTARY Govt of C.G. R.N. C.G. 2008

Ekta Dhody

contd....2

(5)

(3)

(4) PT. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

MEDICAL & HEALTH AND RESEARCH CENTRE

Main Hospital Sector-9,

Steel Authority of India Limited,

Bhilai Nagar,

Tah. & Distt. Durg (C.G.)

Through :- Director of Medical And Health Services.

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226(3) OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (C) No. 1229 of 2007

Petitioner — Smt. Ekta Dhody

Versus

Respondents — Sanjay Kumar Agrawal and others

Single Bench: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri**.

Shri V.G. Tamaskar, Advocate for the petitioner.

ORDER

(Passed on 1st day of March, 2007)

The following order of the Court was passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. By this petition, the petitioner seeks a writ in the nature of mandamus to quash the impugned order (P/3). The petitioner has not pointed out any order which is sought to be quashed in this petition.
2. On perusal of the papers, it is found that Annexure P/3 is the application filed by one Shri Sanjeev Kumar Agrawal for claim under Section 163-A, Motor Vehicle Adhiniyam, 1988. It is difficult to understand how the claim filed by the injured person, in an accident, can be quashed in the writ petition.
3. The petitioner has further sought for a direction to decide the preliminary objection raised by the petitioner in the said claim case. The petitioner has not pointed out any order, asto whether the application filed by him has not been or has been considered or any order has been passed by the tribunal.
4. This petition is not maintainable, being frivolous, as it does not disclose any cause of action and lacks complete material facts. The petition has been filed in such a way as if, this petition is as original petition before the Tribunal. It appears to be abuse and misuse of the judicial process.
5. Thus, this petition is dismissed summarily.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Bablu